Professional Educator Standards Board

Getting and Keeping the Teachers We Need: *Paying for What We Value*

In Fall 2001, The Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) invited staff from the Washington Education Association, Office of Financial Management, and Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction to combine efforts and interests by forming a collaborative study group to explore research and state activities related to alternative models of teacher compensation. This paper summarizes the group's initial study as well implications for next steps in Washington. The PESB gratefully acknowledges the contributions of these staff in the preparation of this report.

Teachers need to be paid more, but they also need to be paid differently. While the system of teacher development has changed dramatically in recent years, the system of compensation has not. Teachers need a compensation structure that more appropriately provides incentives that are aligned with the changing demands of their profession.

Washington's current model for compensating teaching professionals:

- May be inadequate to attract professionals to teaching.
- May not be structured to keep teachers in the profession.
- Communicates that we value years spent in the classroom over demonstrations of professional capacity.
- Conflicts with a new system of certification and professional growth.

The Professional Educator Standards Board has evaluated data on teacher retention and teacher shortages in Washington state, reviewed the development of the existing model based on academic degrees and years of experience, and consulted with one of the nation's leading experts on teacher compensation models. This brief presents a case for considering different compensation models, outlines questions that must be answered to create a different model, and lists the conditions that make changing the model more likely to occur.

The relationship between compensation and teacher supply

While there are many factors that influence why people enter into or stay with the teaching profession, research shows that compensation is a crucial one, both in terms of overall adequacy as a living wage, and what it communicates to teachers about their relative value as professionals.

Teaching has a significantly higher attrition rate than other non-teaching professions — 16% compared to 11%.[1]

In Washington State, 11.4% of our teachers leave the profession in the first year compared to 9% nationally. Twenty-two percent leave after three years, and 34% leave after five.[2]

In a 1999 Washington State Institute for Public Policy survey, 43% of beginning teachers cited "salary level" as the primary reason that might cause them to leave the profession within their first five years.[3]

Research shows that even teachers with strong levels of intrinsic motivation are still strongly influenced by extrinsic motivations, generally in the form of monetary recognition.[4]

Washington is also experiencing teacher shortages in specific subject areas that may become more severe over the next five years. Based on 2002 OSPI-commissioned survey data, 86% of Washington school districts cited shortages in special education, mathematics, physics, chemistry, music, ESL, Japanese, early childhood special education, biology, and bilingual education.[5]

The severity of shortages differs from district to district and county to county. For example, districts in Pend Oreille and Cowlitz Counties forecast considerable or increasing need in 27 teaching areas, while districts in Spokane and Skamania counties identified only one.

For Washington State to attract and keep the teachers we need today and in the future, we'll have to do a better job at providing incentives for:

- attracting teachers in subject areas and geographic regions experiencing shortages;
- retaining teachers rather than losing them to better-paid careers;
- providing career growth opportunities within teaching which are well-defined, clearly benefit students, and are compensated;
- ensuring that the toughest teaching assignments go to highly effective teachers; and
- enhancing teachers' capacity to employ more effective practices.

The rationale for Washington's current teacher compensation system

Washington's salary allocation model provides pay increments based on teachers' years of experience and education credits. (See Appendix A.) Using this model, school districts receive funds from the state for teacher salaries based on the district's average mix of teachers' experience and education. The state schedule is used for allocation purposes only. While local school boards have the authority to negotiate local salary schedules, however they must stay within minimum and maximum salary requirements.

The state salary allocation model is one piece of the K–12 funding structure that was instituted in response to the school funding lawsuits in the 1970's. When the state began to institute a statewide system, there was a great deal of salary variability among districts. The state elected to equalize salaries by increasing the base over time, rather than by freezing or reducing those who were above average. While the state has made an effort to reduce the variability in salary allocations over time, 34 districts remain grandfathered at a higher allocation rate than the remaining 262 districts. Districts that have retained their grandfather status range from 0.1% to 6.3% above the state salary allocation model.

State salary controls restrict local districts' ability to vary from the schedule within their base salary contracts. Districts can offer teachers supplemental pay for performance of additional responsibilities and activities not connected to a teacher's regular or extracurricular contract. A major component of this is time, responsibility, and incentive pay (TRI pay). This can add as little as $100 or as much as $8,600 to a teacher's annual contract and averages $5,148 per year.[6]

In every case, TRI pay is locally determined and funded on a year-to-year basis.

The strength of Washington's single salary allocation schedule is that it was designed to be intentionally objective, equitably recognizing level of education and years of experience, and protecting teachers from bias. It was also intended to allow districts equal ability to attract and hire experienced teachers, rather than compete or be forced to focus hiring on less experienced, thereby less costly, teachers.

A 2000 National Education Association study on the single salary schedule concluded that: "the single salary schedule based on training and experience won out in competition with less objective teacher pay systems characterized by discrimination in compensation based on gender, race, and a host of other subjective considerations. It won out because of the ease of administration and low operating costs, and because of its compatibility with sound principal-teacher relationships and teacher collegiality. It won out because it supports the basic structure of the occupation."[7]

Despite these positive aspects, the limitations of the system are significant and growing more problematic. By basing allocations entirely on years of service and degree/credits earned, the salary schedule allocates funds to districts without consideration of:

- Cost of living differences among districts;
- Incentives to recruit and retain highly-qualified teachers to struggling and low-performing schools or hard-to-staff schools experiencing shortages or high-turnover;
- Alignment with a performance-based system of certification and professional growth that includes demonstrated impact on student learning, differentiated responsibilities and career growth opportunities, and professional growth directly linked to school improvement.

If the compensation system needs changing, what are the alternatives?

A growing number of states and districts that are in the process of supplementing or replacing altogether their existing single-salary schedules with new models of compensation that better align with new systems of teacher recruitment, preparation, and professional growth. The various models can be grouped under two basic categories *:

1. **Knowledge- and Skill-Based Pay.** This includes models in which districts and states tie compensation to levels of certification, objective evaluation systems, demonstrated professional growth, career growth, increased responsibility, and/or professional achievements such as National Board Certification.
2. **Differential Pay.** This includes pay that recognizes cost of living differentials and other market-based factors, and additional pay to teach in high-need, low-performing, or hard-to-staff schools.

Knowledge and Skill-Based Pay

Washington's current single salary schedule assumes that a teacher with more years of experience and credits has a broader array and greater depth of professional knowledge and expertise than one who has taught a shorter period of time and accumulated fewer credits.

Knowledge- and skill-based pay systems tie pay to demonstrated performance of desired knowledge and skills. These systems appropriately recognize that teachers do not emerge from preparation programs with all the skills they will ever need. They also recognize that schools and districts have different improvement goals and need to provide opportunities and incentives for their teachers to obtain additional knowledge and skills that will help districts meet those goals. These systems can be designed to recognize a range of knowledge and skills, such as:

- Development of greater professional expertise in a content area, curriculum, or instruction;
- Expertise or leadership in professional development, curriculum development, or mentoring of other teachers; or
- School leadership or community outreach responsibilities.

** This report does not address the related issue of school-based performance awards, whereby entire school staff receive pay in recognition for student achievement gains. The Academic Achievement and Accountability Commission has studied this concept and it's implications for compensation. Additional information on this topic may be found at their website — www.k12.wa.us/accountability.*

These systems can naturally reinforce the career stages of teachers and align with a state's certification system. Most importantly, it encourages career growth by continuously focusing on increasing knowledge and skills that are directly related to state, district and/or school goals for improving student learning.

The work of Dr. Allan Odden and the Teacher Compensation Project at the Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) is the foundation of nearly every current district and state compensation reform effort[8]. The compensation study group drew heavily on their work. According to CPRE, there are two critical principles on which any knowledge- and skill-based pay system must be based:

- **Clear, specific, measurable skills.** These skills should be related directly to the needs and requirements of the system — state, district, or school — and provided in written form following clear standards.

- **An objective, sound, credible assessment system** to determine when desired knowledge and skills have been attained.

For teaching to be a profession with progressive and differentiated career growth opportunities clearly aimed at improving student learning, these opportunities cannot be continuously shifting targets available to teachers who are at the right place at the right time. Instead they must be well-defined, roles and responsibilities to which teachers can aspire and properly train, and be certain that when they have attained them that the financial rewards will be provided.

One of the key differences between knowledge- and skill-based pay systems and earlier merit-pay systems is that merit pay encouraged competition among teachers, with award of pay often based on subjective or poorly-defined criteria. To truly act as an incentive for performance, criteria for who receives knowledge- and skill-based pay must be clearly defined and perceived by educators as fair, attainable, and promoting collegiality.

Key questions CPRE identified as needing to be considered in designing a knowledge- and skill-based pay system include:

- What knowledge and skills will be rewarded or what teaching standards will be adopted or adapted?
- Will all teachers be able to be rewarded for obtaining the knowledge and skills, or will districts have to demonstrate need?
- How will competencies be developed and determined?
- How much will each performance level be worth?
- How do you retire specific knowledge and skills?
- How do you add new, specific knowledge and skills?
- How do the knowledge- and skill-pay system as well as the evaluation system inform professional development activities?
- Should knowledge- and skill-based pay be a bonus or part of base pay?

Iowa: Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Act

Proposes to create a new compensation system that includes statewide mentoring, new career paths, pilot variable pay programs, redesigned professional development and new Iowa teaching standards for purposes of evaluation.

- Salaries progress along 4-step career path — Provisional, Professional Career I, Professional Career II, Advanced
- Beginning teachers receive 2-years mentoring and mentors receive salary enhancement
- Comprehensive evaluation every 5 years allows advancement to higher levels
- Formative evaluations in other years to determine professional development choices

Cincinnati, OH: Proposed Knowledge- and Skill-Based Salary Schedule

5 levels — movement requires demonstrated competency on some combination of test results, evaluations, and/or formal observations.

- Apprentice teacher
- Novice teacher
- Career teacher
- Advanced Teacher
- Accomplished Teacher

Plan supplants traditional structure and has additional pay opportunities within each of the 5 levels, including:

- MA degree in content area
- PhD in education or content area
- NBPTS Certification
- Dual certification
- Technology expertise
- Comprehensive Reform Model Training
- Team skills
- Leadership Skills
- Specific Curriculum Training
- Content specific
- Lead teacher roles

Differential Pay

Rather than focusing on the acquisition of knowledge and skills by individual teachers, differential pay addresses supply and demand challenges by focusing on how knowledge and skills are distributed across locations and the overall composition of the teaching force.

Some states and districts are addressing supply and demand challenges by creating pay-related incentives, including:

- Signing bonuses
- Higher salaries for subject matter shortage areas
- Housing subsidies and mortgage assistance
- Bonuses contingent on designated years of service
- Higher pay for serving in low-performing school

As with knowledge- and skill-based pay, differential pay needs to be designed carefully to produce desired results. States and districts that have used differential pay as a recruitment tool, but failed to follow through with adequate support for teachers, or have poor facilities or working conditions, have experienced high attrition rates that undermine their efforts.[9] States and districts have also had varying success in using increased pay as an incentive to lure existing teachers to rural and remote areas. Policymakers may want to weigh this incentive against investments in developing future teachers from within those communities.

Differential pay also has the potential for exacerbating competition among districts, something Washington's salary allocation model was originally designed to lessen.

Appendix B contains models of step and column salary models with knowledge- and skill-based and differential pay additions. We include these with a caution, that is shared by CPRE, that the "me too" temptation to adopt other's models does not work where redesigning compensation is concerned. CPRE urges policymakers to take into consideration the local context, including the problems being addressed, the improvements desired, and the desired results being rewarded.

Differential Pay

Utah

New math and science teachers receive signing bonuses of $5,000 in exchange for 4-year teaching commitment

New York City

Fifteen percent pay raises for teachers in high-need, low-income schools

North Carolina

Scholarships and conditional loans for teaching service in low-performing, high-poverty schools

Aligning compensation to a performance-based system of teacher development

Washington is putting into place a number of key components that address the necessary elements that must be in place in order to implement a knowledge and skills-based compensation system.

Washington's emerging system of teacher preparation, certification, ongoing professional growth, and evaluation are all focused on demonstrating positive impact on student learning. What is missing in Washington is a compensation system aligned to these new directions.

Changes in the professional development model

The state's current compensation model matches up well with a professional development model that requires teachers to earn clock hours (a form of credit) for maintaining a certificate. Both models reward investments of time. By contrast, Washington's 2000 adoption of new performance-based teacher preparation and certification standards represented a dramatic shift from a system based on successful completion of courses and credits, to a system which requires prospective teachers to demonstrate competency against new, tougher teaching standards. For currently certified teachers, the shift to a more performance-based system for maintaining certification is just beginning. Washington still operates under a model of a 150 clock hour, 5-year renewal cycle. However, a committee of educators is currently studying statewide use of approved professional growth plans as the means for certificate renewal, thus removing the input-based clock-hour requirements. Professional growth plans would document course work and other professional development activities (such as mentoring, research, curriculum development, community outreach) that teachers propose for the purpose of maintaining the validity of their continuing certificates. Each plan would be a negotiated agreement between the teacher and a school/district team, to ensure that the plan aligns with and supports district and school learning improvement goals. The use of professional growth plans to define a teacher's development, and as a means for maintaining certification, is significantly different from the past model of professional development whereby individual teachers could determine what professional development to pursue based on individual interest alone.

Figure 1: **Teacher Development System**

	Traditional System	System Washington is Implementing
Preparation	Everyone takes same sequence of courses and credits. Primarily campus-based. Little opportunity for immediate application of theory into classroom. Little assessment of prior knowledge and experience	Greater variance in age and point in career at entry. More site-based programs with greater opportunity for immediate classroom application of new knowledge and skills. Routine assessment of prior knowledge and experience to create individualized preparation plans.
Certification	Successful completion of courses and credits	Completed when successfully demonstrate competency against well-defined standards
Professional Development	Individually determined	Professional Growth Plans — tied directly to school and district learning improvement goals
Teacher Evaluation	Process may or may not be connected to professional development	Explicitly connected to standards. Teacher development is the focus.

This change to a truly performance-based system is not an easy one for teacher preparation programs or for schools and districts, and what is described above and in Figure 1 is not yet occurring system wide. As with any significant change, some institutions and districts are far ahead of others in their implementation. In some cases, making this change may require greater assistance.

From this description of the teacher preparation, certification, and ongoing professional development system towards which Washington is working, it becomes clear that a compensation model based on credits and years of experience does not align with this shift toward a performance-based system.

Beyond the principle of restructuring our compensation system to align and support performance-based teacher development, there is greater urgency with respect to dysfunctions in the system already occurring.

- Under the previous certification system, a teacher who by year 4 meets the requirements for the second-level, continuing, certificate by attaining either a master's degree or 45 credits would be eligible for the base salary in the BA+45 or MA+0 cell. Under the new certification system, however, a teacher who by year 4 meets the requirements for the new second-level, more rigorous but less credit-driven, professional certificate, may do so having accumulated as few as 15 credits, and thus might only be eligible for the base salary in the BA+15 cell. Using the 2001–2002 table, this would represent a difference in base pay between the teacher under the old system versus new of between $1,793 and $4,859 respectively.

- Another example is teachers who complete one of Washington's alternative route or other post-baccalaureate, certification-only programs. These candidates may earn anywhere from 27 to 67 quarter hour credits, depending on the institution, and although they've met equivalent standards, will enter at very different points on the salary schedule, the first at the BA+15 level, the second at the BA+45. Again using the 2001–2002 table, this represents a difference of $1,537.

Given these examples, it is clear that the current model doesn't work pragmatically, as it doesn't align with what we will expect of teachers and the performance benchmarks by which we will measure those expectations.

Changes in teacher evaluation

Knowledge- and skill-based pay systems rely on objective, reliable systems for evaluating teacher performance. CPRE recommends an evaluation process designed by researcher and author Charlotte Danielson. However, there are seven Washington school districts piloting an evaluation system which incorporates the structural aspects of Danielson's model, but with a greater deliberate focus on student learning and Washington-specific standards, and thus may be a better fit for Washington. Every aspect of the work behind these pilots has been informed by research as well as by data collected by practitioners in the field. The strength of the research, the focus of the process on student performance, and the explicit connection to teacher certification standards has resulted in considerable "buy in" from those educators participating in the pilots. The current challenge is creating implementation tools and guidance that is user friendly and allows districts to transition to this model without undue expenditure of time and resources.

Many of the components of the process are explicitly connected to initiatives and activities that are currently underway in Washington schools. Adopting and/or adapting this model can provide a "jump start" to meet state and federal reform guidelines.

Next Steps for Washington — Designing and Implementing Compensation Reform

More work and study needs to occur. Other's experience suggests that more detrimental than remaining with the existing single-salary schedule is a hastily designed system in which educators lack

confidence. Compensation reform tends not to succeed as an overnight, single leader-driven proposal. States and districts that hastily developed proposals, that did not follow a solid design and development process, and subsequently failed are finding it difficult to reopen the conversation due to distrust.

Successful development and implementation of new systems of compensation, according to CPRE, requires these elements:

1. **Involvement of all key parties,** especially those whose compensation is being affected, is the most important principle for successfully changing compensation policies.
2. **Broad agreement on desired educational results.** Must have agreement on desired results in order to design incentives to get there.
3. **Comprehensive evaluation system** to assess whether desired results are being achieved.
4. **Adequate, stable funding.** Educator perception of lack of funding or funding stability has been the key aspect of failure of many compensation reform efforts. This includes stable investments in professional development needed to achieve desired knowledge and skills.
5. **No quotas.** All teachers should have the opportunity to achieve increments in a knowledge- and skill-based pay system.
6. **Management and labor maturity**. Administrators, school boards, unions, associations, and other parties must have solid positive working relationships and shared education goals and objectives on which compensation reform can be built.
7. **Commitment and persistence.** CPRE's experience suggests that even the best laid plans have "bugs" that need fixing and adjustments that need to be made over time. This requires full participation over time and desire for continuous improvements.

The Professional Educator Standards Board believes the next step for Washington in developing potential new teacher compensation systems starts where this report ends: with the need for more indepth study, informed by experts in both teacher development and compensation systems, and significant involvement and dialogue with practicing educators and education stakeholder organizations. Key questions and issues to guide this study should include:

1. To what degree do we modify the current salary allocation schedule versus adding on pay increments? What are the implications for stability of funding?
2. What does transition to a new system involved? How would we phase this in? How would we "grandfather" existing teachers under the old system while still offering them career growth opportunities with related pay rewards?
3. Most states have begun by first supporting district pilots. Is this possible/advisable for Washington State in light of its statewide allocation model?
4. What are the budget implications along the time line?
5. How does this relate to current use of TRI dollars?
6. Do the current limitations on local bargaining need to be lifted to accommodate negotiating district-unique pay structures or can the state provide an incentive for districts to pilot unique plans through the existing TRI system?
7. How do we ensure that Washington districts have in place the necessary elements to make this work, such as a sound, objective evaluation system and a well-articulated system of professional growth tied to school and district improvement?
8. Educational staff associates are certificated instructional staff who are also included on the current salary schedule. What will a new system mean for them? Can objective criteria be defined that are consistent with the unique tasks they perform?
9. How will successful change be measured? Improvements in: Teacher retention? Employee satisfaction? Student scores?
10. If considering differentiated pay plans such as cost-of-living differentials or pay that reflects market value of certain teaching fields, will this be aimed at creating greater equity statewide, or for regions experiencing shortages and/or high attrition?

Appendix A:
K–12 Salary Allocation Table for Certificated Instructional Staff

2001–2002 K–12 Salary Allocation Table for Certificated Instructional Staff

Years of Service	BA+0	BA+15	BA+30	BA+45	BA+90	BA+135	MA+0	MA+45	MA+90 or PhD
0	27,467	28,209	28,977	29,746	32,219	33,811	32,931	35,403	36,996
1	27,836	28,588	29,366	30,171	32,668	34,252	33,297	35,793	37,377
2	28,464	29,231	30,025	30,900	33,414	35,030	33,995	36,509	38,124
3	29,401	30,192	31,009	31,931	34,490	36,177	35,027	37,585	39,273
4	30,063	30,896	31,727	32,689	35,290	37,007	35,755	38,355	40,072
5	30,750	31,595	32,443	33,468	36,085	37,853	36,503	39,121	40,889
6	31,147	31,974	32,850	33,928	36,531	38,308	36,904	39,508	41,285
7	32,164	33,010	33,909	35,055	37,724	39,569	38,031	40,700	42,546
8	33,195	34,088	35,008	36,248	38,954	40,867	39,225	41,930	43,843
9		35,205	36,169	37,455	40,223	42,201	40,430	43,200	45,177
10			37,344	38,724	41,529	43,572	41,700	44,505	46,549
11				40,029	42,895	44,979	43,005	45,872	47,956
12				41,293	44,298	46,446	44,362	47,275	49,422
13					45,736	47,947	45,766	48,712	50,923
14					47,181	49,505	47,212	50,251	52,481
15					48,408	50,792	48,439	51,557	53,846
16 or more					49,376	51,808	49,407	52,589	54,923

2002–2003 K–12 Salary Allocation Table for Certificated Instructional Staff

Years of Service	BA+0	BA+15	BA+30	BA+45	BA+90	BA+135	MA+0	MA+45	MA+90 or PhD
0	28,300	29,064	29,856	30,649	33,196	34,836	33,929	36,476	38,118
1	28,680	29,455	30,257	31,086	33,659	35,291	34,306	36,879	38,510
2	29,327	30,117	30,936	31,837	34,428	36,093	35,025	37,616	39,280
3	30,293	31,107	31,950	32,899	35,536	37,274	36,089	38,725	40,464
4	30,975	31,833	32,690	33,681	36,360	38,129	36,840	39,519	41,288
5	31,682	32,553	33,427	34,483	37,179	39,001	37,610	40,307	42,129
6	32,091	32,943	33,847	34,956	37,639	39,470	38,023	40,706	42,537
7	33,139	34,012	34,937	36,118	38,868	40,769	39,185	41,934	43,836
8	34,202	35,122	36,069	37,348	40,135	42,106	40,414	43,202	45,172
9		36,272	37,266	38,591	41,443	43,481	41,656	44,510	46,548
10			38,477	39,898	42,788	44,894	42,964	45,855	47,960
11				41,243	44,196	46,344	44,309	47,263	49,410
12				42,545	45,642	47,854	45,707	48,708	50,921
13					47,123	49,401	47,154	50,189	52,467
14					48,611	51,006	48,644	51,775	54,073
15					49,876	52,333	49,908	53,121	55,479
16 or more					50,873	53,379	50,906	54,183	56,588

Appendix A:
Structural Models of Knowledge- and Skill-Based Pay

Two Major Approaches to Knowledge- and Skill-Based Plans:

1. Redesign the entire salary schedule to include knowledge and skills as a core element that triggers major salary increases
2. Keep current steps and lanes structure and add knowledge and skill elements

Full Knowledge- and Skill-Based Pay Plus Additions

	Step	BA	MA	MA+90 or PhD
Entry	1	$$	$$	$$
	2	$$	$$	$$
Basic	1	$$	$$	$$
	2	$$	$$	$$
Career	1	$$	$$	$$
	2	$$	$$	$$
	3	$$	$$	$$
	4	$$	$$	$$
	5	$$	$$	$$
	6	$$	$$	$$
	7	$$	$$	$$
	8	$$	$$	$$
Master	1	$$	$$	$$
	2	$$	$$	$$
	3	$$	$$	$$
	4	$$	$$	$$
Advanced	1		$$	$$
	2		$$	$$
	3		$$	$$
	4		$$	$$

Can include additional pay based on state or local identified knowledge- and skill-based or other differential factors, including:

- Added endorsement
- Teaching in subject shortage areas (math, bilingual, special education) or hard-to-staff schools (rural/remote or low-performing)
- Regional cost of living adjustments
- National Board certification
- Addition of skills needed as part of improvement plan (e.g., technology skills)
- Leadership roles within schools (instructional leader, curriculum specialists, mentor)

An Add-On Approach to Existing Structure

Step	BA	MA	MA+	Knowledge and Skills
1				Developing Professional +5%
2				Proficient +10%
				Advanced +15%
n				National Board Certified +20%

Endnotes

[1] Ingersoll, R (2002) *The Teacher Shortage: A Case of Wrong Diagnosis and Wrong Prescription*. NASSP Bulletin, 86, June, 16–31.

[2] Washington statistics from 2002 Data from the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. National data from Odden, A. and Kelley, C. (2002) Paying Teachers for What They Know and Do. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

[3] Washington State Institute for Public Policy. Beginning Teacher Survey. Olympia, WA 1999.

[4] Kreps, D.M. (1997). Intrinsic Motivation and Extrinsic Incentives. *The American Economic Review*, 87, 359–364.

[5] Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (2002). *Educator Supply and Demand in Washington*. Olympia, WA.

[6] Washington Education Association. (2002) 2001–2002 Time, Responsibility, and Incentive (TRI) Pay Schedules. Federal Way, WA.

[7] NEA Professional Standards and Practice Committee. (2000) *Teacher Compensation Systems*. Washington, DC: National Educational Association

[8] More information on the research and state- and district-level work of the Consortium for Policy Research in Education's Teacher Compensation Project can be found at their web site — www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/tcomp or by contacting the PESB.

[9] Gold, R. (2001). Teacher bonuses get mixed grades: States give higher marks to merit based awards than hiring incentives. *Wall Street Journal*. February 22, p. B17.

Additional resources

The PESB has assembled an extensive collection of research articles and information from other states and districts related to compensation reform and alternative compensation models. For more information, contact the PESB office.

Washington State Professional Educator Standards Board

Old Capitol Building
600 Washington Street, S., Room 249
P. O. Box 47236
Olympia, WA 98504-7236

360/725-6275 ■ FAX 360/586-4548
e-mail: pesb@ospi.wednet.edu
http://www.pesb.wa.gov/